

### **Remarks**

Claims 1-15 are pending. Claims 1-15 are rejected.

Claims 1-9 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0034611 (Ooya) and U.S. Pat. No. 5,664,183 (Cirulli). Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooya, Cirulli and U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0191687 (Pavone).

With regard to claim 1, Ooya does not disclose analyzing the quality system to identify at least two improvements to be made based on knowledge and judgment of the auditor. The Examiner attempts to find this limitation in the following passages of Ooya:

As described above, according to the present invention, an auditor can perform a preliminary audit of the system for audit without leaving the audit organization, thereby improving the audit efficiency. Because the auditor performs the preliminary audit in-house without leaving the audit organization, the ratio of auditors actually in-house improves, which enables the audit organization to conduct education sessions for improving factors such as the audit techniques of auditors, enabling an improvement in customer service. Furthermore, the customer (the corporation undergoing audit), is able to reduce the number of employee work hours required in dealing with the preliminary audit, as well as reduce the costs (such as travel costs and allowances) associated with the preliminary audit, and consequently receives a cheaper, yet higher quality audit. A electronic system for audit has many practical applications, and so the process of digitizing office work can be accelerated.

Ooya, [0062] (emphasis added).

Reducing the number of employee work hours and reducing costs, however, are not improvements identified based on the knowledge and judgment of Ooya's auditor and do not result from analyzing the quality system. Rather, reducing the number of employee work hours and reducing costs result, according to Ooya, because the “the auditor can perform a preliminary audit of the system for audit without leaving the audit organization, thereby improving the audit efficiency.” Ooya, [0062]. That is, the preliminary audit of Ooya requires fewer customer

resources because the auditor performs the preliminary audit without leaving the audit organization.

With regard to claim 1, the Examiner asserts that “[i]t would have been obvious . . . to incorporate the teachings of Cirulli into the method of Ooya with the motivation of reducing the time for the collection and integration of documentation of ISO 9000 requirements generated by groups of people within an organization . . . .” Office Action, April 4, 2008, p. 3. Ooya, however, states that

An audit system is provided, capable for auditor of performing a preliminary audit of an ISO compliant management system via a network or the like, without actually going to the system site, and offers an enhanced audit content and a shorter audit period by subsequently performing an efficient site audit. The audit system accesses an electronic system for audit via a communication device such as the Internet, audits the system for examination based on the required information sent from the system for examination, and then based on these results performs an efficient site audit.

Ooya, Abstract.

It does not appear that (1) "reducing the time for the collection and integration of documentation of ISO 9000 requirements generated by groups of people within an organization" and (2) Cirulli's "groupware" would serve any useful function within the context of Ooya: Ooya's audit system "accesses an electronic system for audit [and] audits the system for examination based on the required information sent from the system for examination." Ooya, Abstract (emphasis added). One of ordinary skill would not have had reason to combine Cirulli with Ooya.

The dependent claims are patentable because they depend from claim 1.

Applicant's Attorney submits that the claims are in a condition for allowance. Applicant's Attorney respectfully requests a notice to that effect. Applicant's Attorney also invites a telephone conference if the Examiner believes that it will advance the prosecution of this application.

Please charge any fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,

**PERRY L. JOHNSON**

By /Benjamin C. Stasa/

Benjamin C. Stasa

Reg. No. 55,644

Attorney for Applicant

Date: July 3, 2008

**BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.**  
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor  
Southfield, MI 48075-1238  
Phone: 248-358-4400  
Fax: 248-358-3351